

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/755,154		01/09/2004	Kevin J. Moeggenborg	100141	9641
29050	7590	02/17/2006		EXAMINER	
STEVEN V	VESEM <i>A</i>	AN	UMEZ ERONINI, LYNETTE T		
ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL, I.P. CABOT MICROELECTRONICS CORPORATION				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
870 NORTH COMMONS DRIVE				1765	
AURORA, IL 60504				DATE MAILED: 02/17/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/755,154	MOEGGENBORG ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Lynette T. Umez-Eronini	1765				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D resions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 J</u>	anuary 2004.					
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application	· I.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>23</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
·	Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 14-22</u> is/are rejected.						
•	Claim(s) <u>4-13</u> is/are objected to.						
8)⊠	Claim(s) 23 are subject to restriction and/or el	ection requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)⊠ acc	cepted or b) objected to by the I	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
44)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	•	, ,				
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigr ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	• •					
	 Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Burea 	•	ed in this National Stage				
* 6	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ed.				
Attachmer	nt(s)		•				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)				
	er No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/9/04 & 10/26/05</u> .	6) Other:	V				

Application/Control Number: 10/755,154 Page 2

Art Unit: 1765

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-22, drawn to a polishing system, classified in class 252, subclass

79.1.

II. Claim 23, drawn to a polishing method, classified in class 438, subclass

692.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can

be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process

for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different

product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of

using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the process for using the

product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product, such as a

polymer that does not requires a degree of branching of 50% or more.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have

acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction

for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the

search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination

purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/755,154 Page 3

Art Unit: 1765

5. During a telephone conversation with Weseman on 1/25/2006 a provisional

election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-22.

Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Claim 23 is withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as

being drawn to a non-elected invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected

invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one

or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by

a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United

States.

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1-3, 14-20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Sakai et al. (EP 1,279,708 A1).

As to claims 1-3, 14-17, 20, and 22, Sakai teaches a polishing composition that comprises: at least one abrasive; at least one organic compound such as polyoxyalkylene addition polymer; hydrogen peroxide (same as applicants' oxidizing additive) and water (same as applicants' carrier). (Abstract and [0033] and [0075]). The above reads on,

A polishing system comprising:

- (a) a liquid carrier,
- (b) a polymer, and
- (c) a polishing pad, an abrasive, or a combination thereof.

Application/Control Number: 10/755,154

Art Unit: 1765

However, Sakai differs in failing explicitly disclose a polymer having a branching of about 50%, 60% and 70% or greater, in recited respectively in claims 1-3; and a viscosity that is about 70% or less in claim 19.

Sakai illustrates the claimed combination of a liquid carrier, polymer and polishing pad, an abrasive, or a combination thereof is known. However, the presently claimed combination would obviously have been provided as a result of using Sakai's polishing composition in a polishing method in the same manner as those of the claimed invention.

11. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai (EP '708 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chou et al. (US-PGPUB 2002/0125461 A1).

Sakai differs in failing to disclose a polishing system wherein the system comprises an abrasive fixed to a polishing pad.

Chou teaches a polishing system can comprise a polishing pad wherein either an abrasive is suspended in the liquid portion of the polishing system or the abrasive can be fixed on a polishing pad ([0015-0017]).

Chou illustrates a polishing system wherein the system comprises an abrasive fixed to a polishing pad is known. Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to substitute Sakai's polishing pad with an abrasive fixed to a polishing pad as taught by Chou because both pads are seen as equivalent for the purpose of effecting a method of polishing semiconductor

70°1

Application/Control Number: 10/755,154

Art Unit: 1765

wafers and other substrates, such as memory disk and high dielectric constant films (Chou, [0026]).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 12. Claims 4-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 13. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: As to claims 4-13, the prior art of record taken alone or in combination fails to teach a polishing system that comprises dendritic or dendrimer polymers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lynette T. Umez-Eronini whose telephone number is 571-272-1470. The examiner is normally unavailable on the First Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/755,154

Art Unit: 1765

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit 1765

Itue

February 2, 2006

MISSIMILATER EXAMINER

Page 7

NC